

**MINUTES  
LAKE COUNTY ZONING BOARD  
MAY 2, 2007**

The Lake County Zoning Board met on Wednesday, May 2, 2007 in the Commission Chambers on the second floor of the Round Administration Building to consider petitions for rezonings, conditional use permits, and mining site plans.

The recommendations of the Lake County Zoning Board will be submitted to the Board of County Commissioners at a public hearing to be held on Tuesday, May 22, 2007 at 9 a.m. in the Commission Chambers on the second floor of the Round Administration Building, Tavares, Florida.

**Members Present:**

Timothy Morris, Vice Chairman	District 1
Scott Blankenship	District 2
James Gardner, Secretary	District 3
Phyllis Patten	District 4
Mark Wells	At-Large Representative
Larry Metz	School Board Representative

**Members Not Present:**

Paul Bryan, Chairman	District 5
----------------------	------------

**Staff Present:**

R. Wayne Bennett, AICP, Planning Director, Planning and Community Design Division  
Brian Sheahan, AICP, Chief Planner, Planning and Community Design Division  
Rick Hartenstein, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Design Division  
Ryan Guffey, Senior Planner, Planning and Community Design Division  
Sherie Ross, Public Hearing Coordinator, Planning and Community Design Division  
Ross Pluta, Engineer III, Engineering Division  
Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney

Vice Chairman Morris called the meeting to order at 9 a.m. He led in the Pledge of Allegiance, and James Gardner gave the invocation. Vice Chairman Morris noted that a quorum was present. He confirmed the Proof of Publication for each case as shown on the monitor. He explained the procedure for hearing the cases on the regular agenda.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b><u>CASE NO.:</u></b>	<b><u>OWNER/APPLICANT/AGENT/PROJECT</u></b>	<b><u>AGENDA NO.</u></b>
Consideration of Minutes	April 4, 2007	
CUP#00/11/2-3	Hammock Citrus, Roger Simpson, III	3
Consent Agenda Approval:		
CUP#07/4/1-3	Donald and Jill Markey/Donald L. Markey, Trustee	4
Regular Agenda:		
PH#15-07-1	Marion Zimmerman	1
PH#26-07-5	Lake County Paisley Fire District	2
	Lake County Public Safety/Rob Richardson	
Voluntary Revocation of Conditional Use Permits		
CUP#148-2	B 3 Leesburg South Venture, LLC	3
CUP#97/4/2-3	Bruce and Nancy Sanford	3
CUP#269A-2	Royal RV Resort	3
CUP#679-2	Florida Power Corporation	3
CUP#92/4/1-5	City of Umatilla	3
CUP#92/1/2-2	Edgar Revis	3

**Minutes**

**MOTION by James Gardner, SECONDED by Scott Blankenship to approve the April 4, 2007 Lake County Zoning Board Public Hearing minutes, as submitted.**

**FOR: Morris, Blankenship, Gardner, Patten, Wells, Metz**

**AGAINST: None**

**NOT PRESENT: Bryan**

**MOTION CARRIED: 6-0**

**Voluntary Revocation of Conditional Use Permit  
CUP#00/11/2-3  
Hammock Citrus, Roger Simpson, III**

Brian Sheahan, AICP, Chief Planner, stated that the applicant has requested the above revocation be removed from the agenda. He has some concerns that the County would like to discuss with the City of Tavares. Therefore, he would like it removed from the agenda at this time and then possibly brought back at a later date, if appropriate.

**MOTION by Phyllis Patten, SECONDED by Scott Blankenship to remove CUP#00/11/2-3 from the agenda.**

**FOR: Morris, Blankenship, Gardner, Patten, Wells, Metz**

**AGAINST: None**

**NOT PRESENT: Bryan**

**MOTION CARRIED: 6-0**

**Consent Agenda**

**CASE NO.: CUP#07/4/1-3**

**AGENDA NO.: 4**

**OWNER: Donald and Jill Markey**

**APPLICANT: Donald L. Markey, Trustee**

Vice Chairman Morris confirmed that there was no one who wished to speak on this case.

**MOTION by Phyllis Patton, SECONDED by Scott Blankenship to recommend the following action on the above consent agenda:**

**CUP#07/4/1-3 Acceptance of withdrawal**

**FOR: Morris, Blankenship, Gardner, Patten, Wells, Metz**

**AGAINST: None**

**NOT PRESENT: Bryan**

**MOTION CARRIED: 6-0**

CASE NO.: PH#15-07-1

AGENDA NO.: 1

OWNER: Marion Zimmerman

APPLICANT: Thomas G. Wenski, Bishop, Archdiocese of Orlando

Ryan Guffey, Senior Planner, presented the case and staff recommendation of approval. He showed the aerial from the staff report on the monitor. He noted that the single-family residence has ten bedrooms. The Archdiocese does not expect large numbers of people to attend meetings at the residence. He noted that one letter of opposition had been received. The applicant is aware that there may be issues with the well and septic tank.

When Scott Blankenship asked about the hours of operation being in the ordinance, Mr. Guffey said that could be incorporated into the recommendation from this Board.

Regarding the ten bedrooms in the existing single-family residence, Larry Metz asked how the 50 daily trips were determined. Mr. Guffey replied that a traditional single-family residence generates about ten trips per day. The 50 daily trips were based upon what would occur if there were five single-family residences; Public Works was comfortable with that figure. If group activities are to take place on this site, Mr. Metz felt there could be a benefit to have some limitations as to what could be done outside the residence in terms of group activities such as hours when these group activities could take place. Mr. Guffey said that could be placed into the Ordinance. Mr. Metz felt that should be considered because if two people stayed in each of the bedrooms, that could result in 20 people. In addition, there could be people at a retreat who do not stay overnight. If all those people were outdoors, the noise could carry. Phyllis Patten commented that when she went camping, there was a standard rule that after 11 p.m., it is quiet time. She questioned if something like that could be added to the Ordinance. Mr. Guffey said staff is recommending a condition that there could be no outdoor activities between 9 p.m. and 9 a.m. Ms. Patten felt 9 a.m. might be a little late in the day.

Vice Chairman Morris stated that this Board is a recommending board only, and the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) will be hearing this case on May 22. He added that all exhibits presented at this meeting by staff, owners, applicants, and those in support or opposition must be submitted to the Public Hearing Coordinator prior to proceeding to the next case.

Michael Wilde with the law firm of Baker, Hostetler, who was representing the Diocese of Orlando, said that generally they agree with staff's recommendations. Mr. Metz asked if he was agreeable to the 9 p.m. to 9 a.m. restriction. Mr. Wilde said they agree with the staff's recommendations in the report. Although they agree with the concept of a time restriction, the general intent is not to have Christian rock bands on the site at any time. However, a total restriction on outdoor activities from 9 p.m. to 9 a.m. may be somewhat restrictive. He would prefer language stating that there would be no audible music or loud disturbances after 9 p.m. In addition, he agreed that 9 a.m. may be a little late in the morning for no outdoor activities. To the north of this property are dense wetlands. Of the 37 total acres, only about seventeen of them are dry so activities would only take place to the south and east. He referred to a neighbor to the south who had concerns about the activities as the neighbor was planning to build her retirement home in the area and did not want a lot of noise. He has spoken to her and has hopefully alleviated some of her concerns. He reiterated that the intent is not to have loud activities. The Diocese was attracted to this area because it is rural, quiet, and on a peaceful lake. There is no intent of constructing any additional buildings at this time. He submitted four pictures as Applicant Exhibit A, and Mr. Guffey showed them on the monitor.

Mr. Blankenship asked what the maximum number of people is anticipated in one day on this site. Mr. Wilde said the Diocese of Orlando covers nine counties. This property would cover the north section of the Diocese. If the Diocese would have a large picnic or carnival, it would not be held at a place like this. The main purpose of this facility, particularly for overnight guests, would be to provide a sanctuary for a priest. However, there would also be meetings, retreats, and gatherings for small groups of people in this quiet setting. Substantial improvements must be made to this property in order to meet codes. He could not anticipate how many bedrooms would remain once all the improvements are made. The outbuildings will

CASE NO.: PH#15-07-1

AGENDA NO.: 1

OWNER: Marion Zimmerman

PAGE NO.: 2

APPLICANT: Thomas G. Wenski, Bishop, Archdiocese of Orlando

also require improvements. There would probably be no more than ten people sleeping in the house at one time. More than the number of people staying in the house, Mr. Blankenship said he had concerns about the number of people who could be there for a larger gathering such as a camp out and if restrictions should be placed in the ordinance. Rather than banning such activities, Mr. Wilde suggested language that would require the applicant to go back through the process if the activities would go above a certain number of people.

Mr. Guffey said staff would recommend no loud music between 9 p.m. and 9 a.m. Ms. Patten reiterated that she felt 9 a.m. is late. Vice Chairman Morris pointed out that a minimum of 17 dwelling units could be placed on this site with the current zoning. Mr. Blankenship agreed that there would be noise restrictions if this site were developed with houses. Ms. Patten said she did not have a problem with restrictions at night, but she did have a problem with restrictions in the morning.

Brian Sheahan, AICP, Chief Planner, said there is an existing noise ordinance in place without adding a noise condition to the ordinance for this case.

Nicole Todd said this is a beautiful, untouched area. She was not opposed to this request. She just finished building a house in December of 2006. She owns 15 high and dry acres; she also owns five acres to the north that is wetland. Her concern is the traffic. She also asked that religious retreat be defined. She did not want the road to be paved as that would bring racing and future accidents. She thought the subject property has about 17 to 20 acres that is high and dry.

Mr. Guffey said staff has a recommendation that the hours of operation for outdoor activities should be limited to 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. No live music or more than 30 persons per day shall be allowed. Limiting the number to 30 persons per day would determine the trip generation. Paving of the roadway would be addressed during the site plan approval process.

Regarding traffic, Ross Pluta, Engineer III, Engineering Division, stated that the impact would be considered de minimis. Normally site plans are required to have paved access. However, in this case with a limited retreat and no large gatherings, paving would not be required. In addition, with little or no right-of-way, the applicant would not be able to pave the road.

Under the current zoning, Mr. Wilde reiterated that 17 houses could be constructed. At four people per house, that would be 68 people total. Therefore, he felt allowing only 30 persons on the property seemed a little low. Mr. Guffey stated that staff would be comfortable with 50 persons per day. Ms. Patten suggested 70 people, the same as the number of people in the 17 houses. She did not feel that was an unrealistic number. Mr. Guffey commented that staff is concerned about the condition of the roadway. It could not handle a lot of traffic.

Mr. Metz read the following suggested conditions into the record.

1. There shall not be outdoor group activities from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.
2. There shall not be music played outdoors or other outdoor activities causing unreasonable noise from 9 p.m. to 8 a.m.
3. There shall not be any commercial-type activities such as carnivals or fairs at any time.
4. The number of overnight guests shall be limited to two persons for each bedroom on the property.

He added that there would not be any limit on the number of people on the property because all the obnoxious concerns have been addressed.

CASE NO.: PH#15-07-1

AGENDA NO.: 1

OWNER: Marion Zimmerman

PAGE NO.: 3

APPLICANT: Thomas G. Wenski, Bishop, Archdiocese of Orlando

Mr. Blankenship felt there should be a maximum set on the total number in attendance for an outdoor activity to prevent 1,000 people coming to the site for a picnic. In addition to the carnivals and fairs, Mr. Metz said other obnoxious activities that could generate loud noise due to the number of people could be added to the third condition.

Mr. Guffey showed on the monitor the sheet of paper listing the conditions read by Mr. Metz and submitted it as County Exhibit A.

Mr. Wilde said the meetings he had spoken of earlier would probably be attended by about 30 to 40 people. If a maximum number of people on the site at one time is set, he would recommend language that would state that if a daily activity includes more than 75 people, the applicant could come back to get an approval. He suggested a limit of 25 people in the house. In response to Mr. Wilde, Mr. Sheahan said Lake County has a public assembly requirement, which may require special permits so it is not necessary to address that in the case ordinance.

In response to Vice Chairman Morris, Mr. Sheahan said there is a provision in the ordinance capping the trip generation at 50 trips per day. If that is exceeded and a complaint is received, Code Enforcement action could be taken at that time. He said staff is in agreement with Ms. Patten's comment regarding limiting the number of people. That could be set at 50 or 60 people, which would correlate directly to the number of trips. Regarding Mr. Metz's comments restricting outdoor activities from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m. that would be reasonable and consistent with existing regulations, although slightly more restrictive. If the Board should decide to restrict live music outside, it must be defined. However, that would be difficult for staff to enforce. The applicant has stated that it is not their intent to have live music unless permitted through a public assembly permit.

Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, said her only comment on Mr. Metz's conditions would be the unreasonable noise in the second condition. Lake County already has a Code provision on noise control. The term "unreasonable" is not used; instead the term "excessive noise" is used and defined. Therefore, she suggested changing the language to read "no excessive noise as defined in Lake County Code Section 14.34 so the County is not creating a different standard of noise for this case than for the rest of the unincorporated County.

Mr. Wilde said he did not want to include no live music as a condition as this could prohibit singing a church song in the backyard with a guitar accompaniment. Vice Chairman Morris said Lake County has an ordinance in place that would address loud music. If there is loud music at the site, he felt confident that neighbors would call to complain. Mr. Wilde said he was not familiar with the Lake County Code section regarding fairs and carnivals, but he would imagine that permits are required. Therefore, he questioned whether it was necessary to include it in the ordinance for this case. He did not have a problem with the conditions regarding the number of people in the bedrooms. Although the hours were acceptable, he would prefer the total restriction on outdoor activities not begin until 11 p.m. The music restriction was also acceptable.

**MOTION by Larry Metz, SECONDED by Scott Blankenship to recommend approval of CFD zoning in PH#15-07-1 with the following conditions:**

1. There shall not be outdoor group activities from 10 p.m. to 7 a.m.
2. There shall not be music played outdoors or other outdoor activities causing excessive noise, as defined in the Lake County Code, Section 14.34, from 9 p.m. to 8 a.m.
3. The number of overnight guests shall be limited to two persons for each bedroom on the property.



**CASE NO.: PH#15-07-1****AGENDA NO.: 1****OWNER: Marion Zimmerman****PAGE NO.: 4****APPLICANT: Thomas G. Wenski, Bishop, Archdiocese of Orlando**

- 4. The overall number of people allowed on the property at any given time shall not exceed 70.**

Mark Wells said his only concern was that no music could be played. He questioned whether that condition should be broader or clarified. Mr. Sheahan said noise is defined as a specific item. Mr. Metz pointed out that music can be played indoors, but it would be subject to the adopted noise ordinance. However, when it is played outdoors, it becomes subject to the second condition within the hours indicated.

Mr. Blankenship said 70 people addresses the higher end of the applicant's need and Public Works may find it a little high on a dirt road; but if it gets past the maximum allowable trips per day, he thought there was a mechanism in place for the case to come back to this Board.

**FOR: Morris, Blankenship, Gardner, Patten, Wells, Metz**

**AGAINST: None**

**NOT PRESENT: Bryan**

**MOTION CARRIED: 6-0**

CASE NO.: PH#26-07-5

AGENDA NO.: 2

**OWNER:** Lake County Paisley Fire District  
**APPLICANT:** Lake County Public Safety/Rob Richardson

Rick Hartenstein, Senior Planner, presented the case and staff recommendation of approval. He showed the aerial, map, and site plan from the staff report on the monitor. When Mr. Hartenstein spoke of the variance request to be heard on May 10, Scott Blankenship confirmed that this Board should vote today assuming that the variance will be approved. Melanie Marsh, Deputy County Attorney, explained that typically the variance would be heard prior to the zoning case; but this is a time-sensitive issue. If the variance were heard in May, it would be the end of June before it would be heard by the Board of County Commissioners (BCC). If the variance is not approved by the Board of Adjustment, the case will not be forwarded to the BCC at the end of this month. Mr. Hartenstein referred to Section 1B on Page 2 of the ordinance regarding setbacks and separation distances being in accordance with BOA#60-07-5 and Section 3.13.07 of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), as amended.

When Vice Chairman Morris asked why the nearby 200-foot tower could not be used, Mr. Hartenstein said more coverage is needed than is provided by the height of that tower. Monopole towers are not constructed over 200 feet. That is why a lattice tower is needed. Mr. Blankenship questioned whether this proposed lattice tower could replace the current monopole tower. Mr. Hartenstein said the monopole tower is under a separate lease agreement.

Robert Richardson, radio coordinator for Lake County Public Safety, said the tornadoes of February 2, 2007 damaged the 1,567-foot Cox communications tower that the County used. It is a long process to get it back in service. He has been receiving complaints from the Sheriff's office and firefighters needing this communication. It has been determined that this request is the most expedient measure since it is County property. They have been working with their vendor, Motorola, who has assured the County that they could have this tower built in about 120 days. The Cox tower will need to go through several processes to make the changes they propose. In addition, a 1,567-foot tower is not readily available whereas most vendors have the steel to produce a 480-foot tower rather quickly. Because weather conditions would tremendously impact construction of the taller tower, no timeline could be given as to when the tower could be reconstructed.

When Vice Chairman asked if the County would go back to the 1,567-foot tower once it is rebuilt, Mr. Richardson said that is under review by the County. The County has a plan to purchase some new radio technology, which would require more towers.

Gary Cooney, attorney for Tony Roberts, said they are present to represent the adjacent property. It appears as if this is a backwards process. He asked the amount of time that is typically given for review of zoning applications. He added that he heard no testimony in the presentation regarding how this site comports with Section 3.13.17 of the Land Development Regulations (LDRs), which specifically addresses towers in Community Facility Districts. Mr. Hartenstein explained that this was an expedited request due to the public safety nature of it with first responders. A normal review time would be a minimum 90 to 120 days.

When Mr. Cooney asked if the applicant could explain where it is in the procurement process, selection process, and actually picking a vendor for the construction of the tower, Mr. Blankenship said this Board has no control over that and would not be addressing that issue.

Ms. Marsh said towers must be located in CFD zoning. Due to this being a public safety issue, Ms. Marsh said the County Attorney's office has rendered an opinion that this case can be heard by the Zoning Board before the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Cooney said they have the ability to allow the County to place a tower on the same site as the monopole tower. The owner of that site has offered to provide the County a location that would be non detrimental to the owner of the site. The owner of the site has a long-term plan to put houses on the site.

<b>CASE NO.:</b>	<b>PH#26-07-5</b>	<b>AGENDA NO.:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>OWNER:</b>	<b>Lake County Paisley Fire District</b>	<b>PAGE NO.:</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>APPLICANT:</b>	<b>Lake County Public Safety/Rob Richardson</b>		

The tower would be further away from those houses. They have offered to do that, but the response from the County has been that they cannot do that because of the timing issue. The Groundhog Day tornadoes took place on February 2. This application was filed two weeks ago. Other parcels that may not harm the neighborhood have not been considered. Therefore, he thought this rezoning request is premature. If it takes six months to go through the procurement process, there is no rush with the rezoning. Ms. Marsh said the County has already been through the procurement process. The County has a contract with Motorola that is pending to go before the BCC, based on these proceedings.

Phyllis Patten said it appears that Mr. Cooney's client is not against the tower, but against where the tower is located because he feels it would impact his personal business. Mr. Cooney said it would impact what he proposes to do with his property in the future. They are willing to compromise by giving the County a different location on their property, but the County has not accepted their offer. When Ms. Patten asked if the reason the County chose this site was because they already own it, Mr. Cooney said the ownership is questionable. According to his research, the Community Association of Paisley gave the property to Paisley Fire District, which may not be a legal entity. Therefore, he did not know if the County actually owns this site. He felt the site they are offering would suit both the County's needs and their needs. Regarding the ownership issue, Ms. Marsh said she and Mr. Cooney discussed this earlier in the week. They discovered that there is an ordinance that was done in 1988/89 where the County assumed all of the responsibilities having to do with the Paisley Fire District. The County is the owner of the property through that ordinance. The Property Appraiser's office still shows it as the Paisley Fire District because the ordinance was not recorded. That is something the County will address with the Property Appraiser's office. In response to Vice Chairman Morris, Ms. Marsh said that if a site that is compatible were offered, the County would still have to go through the process to rezone a portion of the property to CFD for the tower. It would be expedited as this case was.

Mr. Cooney said he has heard no testimony as to how this site and the proposed tower meet the criteria set out in Section 3.13.17. That section has been ignored. There is a request before the Board of Adjustment for other sections of the Code. According to the site plan, this tower is located extremely close to a property line. One of the requirements of the Code is that the tower be designed so that it will fall within the boundaries of the property. He questioned how it would fall within the boundaries of the property if it is set back considerably less than 100 feet.

Mr. Hartenstein read Section 13.13.17 into the record.

Mr. Cooney said it does not appear that staff has considered the rules set out in Section 13.13.17. He has heard no testimony on the aesthetic impact of this lattice tower nor any testimony regarding a variance to Section C, Minimum Standards. Those minimum standards have not been addressed in the staff report or in the presentation.

Mr. Hartenstein said staff looked at the surrounding area, which includes a vacant dairy. Staff did not feel there are any major aesthetic impacts that would be imposed by this tower located behind the building. Whether a tower is 100 feet, 200 feet, or 1,000 feet, it cannot be hidden. There is no way to make it aesthetically beautiful although required landscaping will be addressed during the development review process.

Mr. Blankenship said he definitely would not be in opposition to providing better and state-of-art communication for public needs for Lake County. However, he said he was struggling with a 480-foot tower that could fall 340 feet and land across SR 44. He would not have a problem with the CFD zoning if it was for the fire station only. The location of the tower creates a problem for him. Mr. Hartenstein said that part of the design criteria in the ordinance is that all towers shall be designed by a registered licensed

CASE NO.: PH#26-07-5

AGENDA NO.: 2

OWNER: Lake County Paisley Fire District  
APPLICANT: Lake County Public Safety/Rob Richardson

PAGE NO.: 3

engineer in the State of Florida in accordance with the standard building code requirements, design calculations, and foundation documents used in construction and must be signed and sealed by a registered licensed engineer in the State of Florida. All towers shall be designed in such a fashion that in the event a tower falls, it shall collapse only within the property lines of the lot on which the tower is located.

Mr. Cooney said they object to the location of the tower but are cognizant of the fact that police and fire coverage are necessary in the area and those people need to be safe.

Tony Roberts, land planner, was present to represent the adjacent property owner. He said an application has been submitted for a PUD adjacent to this tower site. They were notified of this request only a week ago, but they are willing to work with all parties involved. The dairy is no longer in operation, and the site has been regraded and reseeded and is now an improved pasture with plans for a residential subdivision. They have designed their site plan to accommodate the existing tower with massive open area around the tower. In the event of a tornado, he questioned a tower falling on the site instead of being scattered everywhere due to high winds. The adjacent property is 353 acres with 150 of that being uplands. He questioned if the subject tower could be placed in the middle of the wetland with the facility being on the upland part of the adjacent site. If the tower should fall at that location, there would be no one within one-half mile. He would like an opportunity to meet with County staff to determine if there is a better location for the proposed tower. They are willing to give the land to the County to facilitate this. He disagreed with the statement in the staff report that said the tower would not adversely affect property values. With such short notice, Mr. Roberts said the owner had already planned a trip out of state; but he will be present at the BCC public hearing on May 22. In response to Mr. Blankenship, Mr. Roberts said the owner has stipulated that he could either provide an easement area similar to the monopole easement or donate a piece of land in the wetland or upland areas. There is an isolated upland area (seven acres) in the northeastern part of the property, bordered by the forest. The tower would not be visible from the highway or anyone's residence. It would require an easement from the property to the north.

Phyllis Patten pointed out that using that land would be complicated with the easement issue, and time is of the essence. Her concern was a fallen tower. Her recommendation would be to support the staff recommendation but ask staff to meet with Mr. Roberts to determine if an alternative solution is possible. Mr. Roberts said there are many different scenarios as to how this could be handled.

Regarding the donation of property, Mr. Richardson said the County has invested quite a bit of time with the Navy because this area is under naval flight restrictions. Before the County could proceed, it had to get clearance from the Navy in order to place a tower in this location. If the location is changed, the County would have to go through the process again, which took a considerable amount of time. The existing tower on the property is 180 feet. The property owner does not own the tower and leases property to Sprint. If the tower was placed on this property, a study would need to be done to ensure the proposed tower would not have an impact on Sprint, which would take additional time. If the adjacent property owner wants to donate property to the County, the County would consider allowing the property owner to bear the cost to move the tower at a later time when the subdivision is started. For now, though, the County needs to move as expeditiously as possible. The proposed tower has been over designed to ensure that it can withstand 150 mile per hour winds as well as add cellular carriers on it. The intended use at this time is for ten antennas, but the tower is being designed for cellular carriers.

James Gardner said that as this discussion has gone on, it appears that the Board has lost sight of the necessity to expedite this application. He had no hesitation in supporting this request, as submitted by staff.

**CASE NO.:** PH#26-07-5 **AGENDA NO.:** 2  
**OWNER:** Lake County Paisley Fire District **PAGE NO.:** 4  
**APPLICANT:** Lake County Public Safety/Rob Richardson

**MOTION by James Gardner, SECONDED by Larry Metz to recommend approval of CFD zoning in PH#26-07-5 to continue the use of a fire station and permit the placement of a 480-foot self-supporting lattice telecommunications tower.**

Mark Wells asked if the law offers any guidance as far as public safety issues versus property owners' rights. Ms. Marsh replied that the County has the power to expedite things if it is in the public safety interest. She could not cite a specific law other than the County's general powers under Chapter 125 of the Florida Statutes.

Mr. Blankenship stated that he would be basing his support on the public service use in general; it has nothing to do with this tower. The tower is going to be decided by the Board of Adjustment and the Board of County Commissioners.

**FOR:** Morris, Blankenship, Gardner, Patten, Wells, Metz  
**AGAINST:** None  
**NOT PRESENT:** Bryan  
**MOTION CARRIED:** 6-0

**Voluntary Revocation of Conditional Use Permits**

<b>CUP#148-2</b>	<b>B 3 Leesburg South Venture, LLC</b>	<b>AGENDA NO.</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CUP#97/4/2-3</b>	<b>Bruce and Nancy Sanford</b>		
<b>CUP#269A-2</b>	<b>Royal RV Resort</b>		
<b>CUP#679-2</b>	<b>Florida Power Corporation</b>		
<b>CUP#92/4/1-5</b>	<b>City of Umatilla</b>		
<b>CUP#92/1/2-2</b>	<b>Edgar Revis</b>		

Brian Sheahan, AICP, Chief Planner, asked the Board to recommend revocation of the above Conditional Use Permits. This request is based upon all of the Conditional Use Permits being annexed by their respective cities and no longer within the jurisdiction of Lake County.

**MOTION by Scott Blankenship, SECONDED by Phyllis Patten to recommend approval of the voluntary revocation of CUP#148-2, CUP#97/4/2-3, CUP#269A-2, CUP#679-2, CUP#92/4/1-5, and CUP#92/1/2-2.**

**FOR:** Morris, Blankenship, Gardner, Patten, Wells, Metz

**AGAINST:** None

**NOT PRESENT:** Bryan

**MOTION CARRIED:** 6-0

**Adjournment**

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Sherie Ross  
Public Hearing Coordinator

---

Timothy Morris  
Vice Chairman